

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-38 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 26, 29, 31, 33, 35 and 37 are independent.

Amendments have been made to the Title, and Abstract of the Disclosure, and claims 26, 37 and 38 have been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references supplied with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 30, 2004, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form filed therewith.

Objection to the Title of the Invention

The Title of the Invention is objected to for not being descriptive. In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention in order to better reflect the subject matter claimed.

Objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure

The disclosure is objected to and guidelines for the content of an Abstract are provided. In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended the Abstract of the Disclosure in order to place it in better form, including reducing it to below 150 words.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 26-28 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,559,827 to Mangerson. This rejection is respectfully traversed. A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Claims 26-28 and 37, as amended, recite a combination of features that are not disclosed or suggested by Mangerson. For example, Mangerson does not disclose or suggest the recited plurality of light sources arranged on a substrate

located directly below the display device; or a diffusion plate arranged directly above the light sources, for uniformly diffusing light irradiated from the light sources. Nor does Mangerson disclose a shutter layer being over a diffusion plate. In fact, Mangerson teaches away from providing the claimed arrangement. In this regard, Mangerson explicitly discloses the advantages of providing a display assembly that employs a reduced number of elements, thereby making the display assembly more robust, easier to manufacture and less costly (col. 1, lines 56-60). In view of this explicit teaching, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide plural light sources directly below the display panel, as recited, because it would result in far more light sources than the side-lit display arrangement of Mangerson, which has relatively few light sources compared to the vastly larger number of light sources that would be needed to be placed directly below the display to properly operate a field sequential driven display, thereby resulting in a display assembly that would not be more robust, would not be easier to manufacture and would not be less costly.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be properly motivated to redesign Mangerson by placing its optical shutter over the diffusion plate 124 to arrive at the claimed invention. Clearly, Mangerson's optical shutter 110 is not located over the diffuser 124 and placing it over diffuser 124 would not appear to result in an improved device, as

it would appear to eliminate the function of the light guide assembly, which is a fundamental aspect of Mangerson's invention, thereby teaching away from doing so.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claims 26-28 and 37 are respectfully requested.

Allowed and Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 1-25 and 29-36 are allowed, and that claim 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the early indication of allowed and allowable subject matter in this application. Claim 38 has been rewritten in independent form to place claim 38 in condition for allowance.

Additional Cited References

Because the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn, and acknowledge Applicants' claim for priority under 37 CFR §119 and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Robert J. Webster, Registration No. 46,472, at (703) 205-8076, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/740,464
Art Unit 2875


Attorney Docket No. 0465-1061P
Reply to October 5, 2005 Office Action
Page 20

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No.: 40,953

EHC/RJW:mmi 

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703)205-8000

Attachment: Abstract of the Disclosure